



ADMINISTRATIVE NOTES

Newsletter of the Federal Depository Library Program

Vol. 16, no. 04

GP 3.16/3-2:16/04

March 15, 1995

Special Council Issue

Make Your Reservations for the Spring 1995 Depository Library Council Meeting

The spring 1995 meeting of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer will convene in Arlington, Virginia from 8:00 a.m. on Monday, April 10 through 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 12. The meeting will be held at the Rosslyn Westpark Hotel in Arlington. The hotel address is:

1900 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22209

A block of rooms has been retained for the annual Federal Depository Conference and the Depository Library Council meeting. Special room rates are \$87 per room, per night. Reservations must be made by calling (703) 527-4814 or (800) 368-3408 or by fax at (703) 522-8864. Please specify the Federal Depository Conference when making your reservation. If you are attending the Council meeting and staying over at the Westpark for the Conference, please extend your reservations through the 13th of April.

The Rosslyn Westpark is 1/2 block from the Rosslyn Metro Station and parking is free to guests and meeting attendees.



Make your plans now!

***The fall Depository Library Council
meeting will be held in Memphis,
Tennessee, October 16-18, 1995.***

Depository Library Council Meeting Agenda, Spring 1995

**April 10 - 12, 1995
Rosslyn Westpark Hotel
1900 North Fort Myer Drive
Arlington, Virginia**

Sunday, April 9

Evening

Informal pre-dinner get-together in hotel lobby (6:00 p.m.)

Monday, April 10

Morning

- 8:00 Registration & Coffee
- 8:30 Welcome & Introductions
 - Jack Sulzer, Council Chair
- 8:45 Welcome and Government Initiatives Update
 - Michael F. DiMario, Public Printer
- 9:15 GPO Update
 - Wayne P. Kelley, Superintendent of Documents
 - J.D. Young, Director, Library Programs Service
 - Judith Russell, Director, Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services
- 10:15 Break
- 10:30 Council Committee Reports & Issues for Council Consideration
- 11:30 Audience Comment: Q&A
- 12:00 Lunch with Council
(Groups will form in hotel lobby.)

Monday, April 10 (cont'd)

Afternoon

- 2:00 ALA/GODORT Report
• Mary Redmond, Chair
- 2:15 Council Forum: Council Members, GPO Staff, Audience
"Public Access to ACCESS: Bringing up Gateways, Introducing WAIS, and
Improving ACCESS in the 'Just-in-time' Environment"
- 3:15 Break
- 3:30 Council Forum (continued)
- 4:15 Council Discussion
Discuss and outline issues before Council
Assign recommendation drafting teams
- 5:00 Adjourn

Evening

- 6:00 3rd Annual Spring Program on the Electronic Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)
Co-sponsored by the District of Columbia Library Association and the
Government Documents Round Table of ALA
- 8:00 Council Business Meeting
Outline areas for recommendations and action items
Drafting teams begin work

Tuesday, April 11

Morning

- 8:30 Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure Open Forum
Open discussion of selected issues raised by the Ad Hoc Committee report
- Gary Cornwell, Committee Chair
 - Duncan Aldrich, Forum Facilitator
- 10:15 Break
- 10:30 Special Conference Program: Federal Electronic Information Policy: The Promise and the Peril from an End-User's Perspective
- Bruce Maxwell, author
- 11:15 Special Conference Program: Americans Communicating Electronically
- Thomas Tate, Department of Agriculture
- 12:00 Lunch with Council
(Groups will form in hotel lobby.)

Afternoon

- 2:00 Regional Libraries Meeting - Open Forum
- Dan O'Mahony, Forum Chair
- 6:30 Adjourn

Evening

- 8:00 Council Drafting Teams Working Sessions

Wednesday, April 12

Morning

- 8:00 Council Presentation of Draft Recommendations and Action Items
- 10:30 Council Adjourns to Depository Library Conference



Depository Library Council Members

Revised February 22, 1995

Term expires September 30, 1995:

Dan O. Clemmer
 Librarian
 IM/IS/OIS/LR, Rm. 3239
 U.S. Dept. of State
 Washington, DC 20520
 (202) 647-3002
 Fax: (202) 647-2971
 E-mail: clemmer@class.org

David R. Hoffman
 PO Box 247
 Harrisburg, PA 17108
 (717) 232-7926

Judith Rowe
 Manager of Research Services
 Princeton University Computing &
 Information Technology
 87 Prospect Avenue
 Princeton, NJ 08544
 (609) 258-6052
 Fax: (609) 258-3943
 E-mail: judith@pucc.princeton.edu

John (Jack) H. Sulzer
 Head, General Reference Section
 E108 Pattee Library
 Pennsylvania State University
 University Park, PA 16802
 (814) 865-3819
 Fax: (814) 865-1015
 E-mail: jhs@psulias.psu.edu (W)
 ui9@psuvm.bitnet (H)

Term expires September 30, 1996:

Cynthia Etkin
 Government Services Supervisor
 Helm-Cravens Library
 Western Kentucky University
 Bowling Green, KY 42101
 (502) 745-6441
 Fax: (502) 745-5943
 E-mail: etkin@wkyuvm.wku.edu

Linda M. Kennedy
 Head, Government Documents Department
 Shields Library
 University of California, Davis
 Davis, CA 95616
 (916) 752-1624
 Fax: (916) 752-3148
 E-mail: lmkenedy@ucdavis.edu

Wilda Marston
 2001 Turnagain Parkway
 Anchorage, AK 99517
 (907) 248-4793
 Fax: (907) 243-4359

Daniel P. O'Mahony
 Government Documents Coordinator
 John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Library
 Brown University
 Providence, RI 02912
 (401) 863-2522
 Fax: (401) 863-1272
 E-mail: ap201159@brownvm.brown.edu

Bobby C. Wynn
 Director of Library Services
 Charles W. Chesnutt Library
 Fayetteville State University
 1200 Murchison Road
 Fayetteville, NC 28301-4298
 (910) 486-1232
 Fax: (910) 486-1746
 E-mail: bobby@lib1.uncfsu.edu

Term expires September 30, 1997:

Phyllis R. Christenson
Director, Information Services Center
U.S. General Accounting Office
441 G Street NW.
Washington, DC 20548
(202) 512-2647
(202) 512-8405
E-mail: pchristenson@gao.gov

Susan Dow
Head, Documents Department
State University of New York at Buffalo
Charles B. Sears Law Library
2022 Northwood Drive
Williamsville, NY 14221
(716) 645-2347
Fax: (716) 645-3860
E-mail: lwlsusan@ubvm.cc.buffalo.edu

Janice Anita Fryer
Reference Librarian
152 Parks Library
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011
(515) 294-2849
Fax: (515) 294-1885
E-mail: jfryer@iastate.edu

Stephen M. Hayes
Reference & Public Documents Librarian
115 Hesburgh Library
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556-2956
(219) 631-5268
(219) 631-6043
E-mail: shayes@vma.cc.nd.edu

Mary Margaret Farrell Parhamovich
Head, Government Documents
James Dickinson Library
University of Nevada-Las Vegas
Las Vegas, NV 89123
(702) 895-1571
(Direct line to her voice mail: call (702)
895-3409 to find out where she can be
reached)
Fax: (702) 895-1207
E-mail: magoo@nevada.edu



DLC Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure

Depository Library Council Meeting

April 11, 1995

The Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure has planned a busy agenda for the upcoming Depository Library Council (DLC) meeting. On Tuesday, April 11 the committee will be conducting 2 separate "open forum" sessions on issues relating to Regional depository libraries.

The first session will be held from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. and will address 3 specific issues that the DLC has asked the committee to look at. This session will be moderated by Duncan Aldrich, Regional Librarian at the University of Nevada, Reno, and will be modeled after the "Technology Tea" that Jane Bartlett held a few years ago. That is, under each discussion topic there will be 3 or 4 possible solutions/scenarios for solving the problem. Duncan will lead a focused discussion of the pros and cons of each possible solution and based on these discussions the committee will make recommendations to Council so that they can develop "Formal Council Recommendations to the Public Printer."

Obviously, for this to succeed it is incumbent upon the committee to come up with some workable solutions to the issues before arriving in Washington. To help meet that goal, community input on the following topics is imperative. Any thoughts or ideas that you may have can be directed to any committee member.

(1) REGIONAL LIBRARIES AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Proposition: The current organization of the regional and selective depository libraries is an ineffective foundation for the future of the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP).

- * Why should the Regional system be maintained? What would be lost without it?
- * Should Regional libraries be evaluated and redesignated based upon a review of their locations, population served, staff resources, technological capabilities, and resources available for support of selective depositories?
- * What vision do Regional librarians share for a structure that would best promote the widest use and preservation of Federal information in a technology-based environment?

(2) REGIONAL LIBRARIES AS ARCHIVES OF FEDERAL INFORMATION

Proposition: Archiving and preserving Federal information in all media, particularly electronic formats, remains an unresolved and troubling issue for Regional libraries and the FDLP.

- * Should Regionals continue to serve the primary role among depositories in archiving all Federal information for the purpose of preservation?
- * Should Regionals continue to serve the primary role of offering comprehensive access to all Federal information deposited in the Depository Library Program--that is, maintaining information in a "just in case" scenario?

(3) REGIONALS AS THE LEADING DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES

Proposition: Given the shortage of resources in libraries generally, and in many Regional libraries in particular, regional libraries can no longer maintain a role of leadership in the Depository Library Program and support selective depository libraries in the future.

- * What is the role of Regionals in establishing and maintaining standards for the professional competence, training, and certification of depository librarians?
- * Should Regionals be responsible for:
 - the technological development of the Depository Library Program;
 - technical training and support of depository librarians; and
 - maintaining technological standards in the depository system?
- * What services should Regionals offer in support of selective depositories?

The afternoon session will be held from 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. and will address topics raised by the morning session. It will also continue discussions begun at last year's Regional meeting. Dan O'Mahony, incoming Chair of Council, will serve as facilitator for this session. Mechanisms are in place to ensure that topics brought up during this session that might necessitate further action will be forwarded to Council for their consideration. Possible topics for this session include:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| • Operational Issues | • Bibliographic Control |
| • Disposition Lists | • Administrative Overhead |
| • Training & Mentoring | • Inspections |
| • Shared Responsibilities | • Space |
| • Retention Requirements | • Electronic Capabilities |

Again, community input (before arriving in Washington) as to what topics should be addressed is essential to a successful "program." Any ideas that you have for possible discussion topics can be forwarded to Dan O'Mahony or Gary Cornwell.

The information that follows includes:

"Vision Statement" for Regional Depositories

Served as the basis of the 3 specific issues on which Council is seeking advice. It will also serve as the preface to the Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure

Committee Discussion Papers

Provided for background purposes, the various discussion papers prepared by committee members raise a number of interesting questions regarding the future structure of the DLP. Continued discussion by depository librarians on any of these topics is always welcome.

List of Committee Members

Up-to-date listing of current members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure.

In addition to this printing in Administrative Notes, this material will also be posted to REGIONAL-L and to GOVDOC-L.

Vision Statement for Regional Depositories

In contemplating the future of regionals in the organizational structure of the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP), it is important not to lose sight of the impact that the library community historically has had in shaping the role of the Government Printing Office (GPO) and the role it continues to play in duplication and dissemination of Federal information to the public.

By common consensus the 53 regionals play an essential role in preserving the health and character of the FDLP by providing information, advice, guidance, training and support. Indeed, the regionals are the strength and wisdom of the depository program. It is the only group within the FDLP with the cohesion to guide the depository community into an uncertain future.

Historically recommendations made by the documents community have become the basis for many of the regulations found in Title 44 of the United States Code and serve as a framework for managing these important collections. The success of this cooperation between GPO and the library community is underscored by a shared belief that access to this information is a fundamental right which sustains and vitalizes our way of government and its citizenry. The information that has been collected and disseminated by the government continues to accumulate at an accelerating pace.

The dissemination and access to the information using the depository network has worked well over the years, but advances in technology, and public demand for greater access already places a strain on existing resources of depository libraries.

In the coming decade the depository community will be challenged by an even greater demand for accessibility to federal resources in electronic format. And although electronic access and delivery of data has been part of the information profession for well over a decade, this method is only now becoming available to the public at the Federal level.

Today we discuss dissemination via fiber optic networks; tomorrow we will discuss satellite transmission. Determining what information will be delivered is already taking shape. In the past five years there has been a dramatic increase in the use and functions available through the Internet. Many government sources are accessible now because of the efforts of non-federal institutions responding to the information needs of their researchers, staff, and students. Growth in the availability of government information in this manner has already established a government information infrastructure based not on the needs of an informed citizenry but on the information needs of specific communities. The realities of the present demand that questions as to what role depositories (regionals and selectives) of the future will play.

With the increase of information available from non-federal sources, what will be the role of regionals and selective depositories?

Will the role of providing access to federal information be met by default by private institutions that are reacting to the information needs of their specific communities?

With the realization of the National Research Education Networks, will greater access to federal information marginalize the need for depository collections?

The major role for regionals and selectives now, and in the future, will be to guide GPO in formulating an information policy that will guarantee reasonable access and thereby protect a citizens right to know.

Access is the critical issue shaping the future of GPO, regionals, and the depository program. How government information is delivered over the next ten years will determine the level, and dollar value attached to the kinds and degree of access.

In view of this already occurring it seems that identifying the information needs of our users and ensuring these needs are met, will be even more critical.

But certainly in the new millennia this will not be our only purpose. Meeting the challenge will require bold and incisive decisions that must lead regionals in partnership with GPO in areas of technical support, depository standards, training, preservation, guidance and consultation.

1. Support for preservation

The depository program faces a crisis common to the library community. The printed and microfiche volumes in member collections are deteriorating. Age, brittleness, handling and abuse, put items in danger of destruction or must be withdrawn from circulation. A significant proportion (possibly half) of member collections will be unusable in a decade. Priceless government records, outside the depository and commercial sphere, may be irretrievably lost. To insure against these losses the depository community along with GPO must quickly work to accomplish the following:

- a. Establish a mechanism for identifying sources of importance and value for preservation and retention.
- b. Initiate and support through grants, or direct funding, preservation efforts to be undertaken by designated regionals.
- c. Create a regional management structure that will guide and coordinate the development of depository collections in a geographic area that factors in retention or archival issues for the area.
- d. Create a national union list of holdings for the purpose of retaining and preserving information of historical significance.

2. Support for technology

The Federal Depository Library Program must rapidly adopt technology as another method of information dissemination. Technology must not become an end in itself, but a method of dissemination "mainstreamed" into the traditional generic practices of selection, acquisition, and reference.

- a. Sensible benchmarks for successful use of technology need to be established to assure both a fair measure of compliance with FDLP guidelines, and realistic assessments to compare and measure performance between member libraries and other information providers.
- b. Efforts to provide access to federal information must not be hampered by the lack of standardization. There is a need for government agencies to adopt search engines for numerical, cartographic, and textual databases, so that the cost of access is not passed along to local depositories in the form of purchases of additional software.

3. Support for professional librarianship

The depository program must adopt a standard of professional competence for active documents librarians. The depository community has always encouraged informed individuals, especially librarians, to manage depository collections. During the last decade a revolution in government information and the depository program has occurred. The accelerated, highly charged environment of government information requires professional management. Standards for professional excellence should be established, with consideration of continuing education and certification.

4. Support for Public Access

The depository program must adopt a standard to identify and measure service for the general public. The depository program currently serves many specific interest groups, and these group often are the parent institutions which fund the libraries which house the

depository collections. How "public" is defined by depository libraries defines the types and levels of support for their collections and the patrons which use them. A uniform minimum standard for "public" support is necessary for better service to the states and communities depository libraries reside in, as well as removing some divisions between libraries.

- a. Regionals must maintain a presence that depositories have historically held in shaping the regulations that define the intent and purpose of the Federal Depository Library Program.

5. Guidance, Consultation, and Technical support

Regionals currently provide training to staff in other depositories without the option of recovering costs associated with training such as travel, material, or staffing. The future regional structure should provide compensation for these services.

Operational Issues **Tom Andersen, California State Library**

It is difficult to discuss operational issues of regional depositories as discrete categories. Discussing any facet of the work leads to a consideration of another. Collection development issues lead to a discussion of staff, physical facilities, bibliographic control, and so on.

Considering the number of years that most libraries have served as depositories, and then as regionals, most meet the determination that a regional is truly a library within a library.

Listed here are some of the major concerns for regionals:

- * Regionals must receive and retain all items offered through the Federal Depository Library Program, unless they are superseded in either print or microfacsimile form.
- * Regionals require additional staff beyond the levels expected of selectives.
- * Regionals must meet the added requirement for INCREASED levels of equipment, training, and in doing so, overcome problems of access for documents on CD-ROM, floppy disks, and other non-traditional formats
- * Regionals are required to provide leadership. Establishing its presence regional staff are expected to provide guidance, provide opportunities for consultation, and accompany GPO inspectors.
- * Regionals must hold all or most documents in perpetuum. Guaranteeing the comprehensiveness and integrity of the state or regions holdings regionals must

formulate and administer policies to manage the disposition of unwanted documents. In large depository communities this can present a formidable task.

To alleviate some of the burden regionals may set up separate housing agreements with other institutions.

Finding libraries willing to participate is difficult as was recently demonstrated with USGS digital orthophotoquad compact discs.

Negotiating and administering the agreements bring another dynamic to regional operations.

- * Regionals must assist selectives with reference questions, ILL, and provide some mechanism for photocopies, fiche-to- fiche copies, or floppy disk copies.
- * Regionals are expected to offer workshops and training sessions.

Service philosophy is the underpinning for all that regionals accomplish or offer. It is the nexus for views on staffing, physical facilities, collection development, bibliographic control, maintenance and outreach.

In this regard all regionals are not created equal. The quality and size of the depository community served and the resources a library brings to this effort can affect the service they can offer or provide. Supporting this view is the study of Hernon, et al, which determined that in comparison to public libraries most academic libraries collect about 25% more items and are likely to have access to technology not yet available in public libraries. A regional in a community with mostly academic depositories may have less of role to play in areas affected by these considerations.

On the other hand most service philosophies in academic libraries are designed to meet the research and information needs of faculty, students, staff, and alumni, and then the general public.

The Hernon study also stated that budget allocation for 92.2% of the regionals was over \$1 million. Although not stated in the study, unlike regionals in public or special libraries, academic libraries have an indirect cost recovery mechanism available through tuition charges and student fees.

While it is expected that all will compete for grants from the same state or federal authorities academic libraries are more likely to receive private endowments.

Realistically, local politics and economics force regionals to reinvent requirements and limit the expectations of GPO.

State and public institutions, either by law or policy, have a difficult time of rationalizing operational costs for services provided in support of depositories across states or part of another state. And yet, for the general public, it is these regional types that will most likely meet their government information needs.

Subject-Based Collections: Issues for Regional/National Coverage

Cindy Etkin, Western Kentucky University

A system of subject-based depository libraries would be based on the "Centers for Excellence" concept and would eliminate Regional depository libraries as we know them today. This type of arrangement would take advantage of subject expertise that has already been established by some libraries, as well as allowing a specialty to be cultivated in others. Additionally, communication and cooperation between the information creators, disseminators, and providers would be enhanced. As I see it, a couple of options can be explored for establishing the geographic boundaries of these centers.

Option 1 would be to have subject-based collections established within the regions as they exist today, with the stipulation being made that 100% of the items must be selected within the region. Many responsibilities would be attached to being a "subject center." The center would have to accept the obligations of maintaining and servicing a comprehensive collection. For example, the archival collections would reside with the center and therefore, disposition lists would have to be processed. These are responsibilities that selectives currently do not have (obviously). This scenario would solve many of the problems that regionals face today (space, processing 100%, disposition lists...) but I am not sure how many selectives would be willing, or more importantly, able to accept obligations of this magnitude.

Option 2 would be to create the subject-based collections and 100% selection of items among the current regional depository libraries. Although this would have less of an impact on selective depositories, than option 1, I can foresee problems/questions with this particular scenario. Once again, having the stipulation for 100% of the items to be selected within a particular region could be established and perhaps eliminate many of the concerns. This option would, however, allow regionals to weed collections as well as have some selectivity and selectives would not have to accept responsibilities for which they have never planned.

Questions to ponder...

1. Could option 1 be possible if larger regions were established? Perhaps Census regions or divisions?
2. Could option 2 be possible if a smaller network of subject-based collections were established? 100% among regionals in the East and 100% among regionals in the West? Census regions or divisions?
3. Would Title 44 have to be amended or could this be done within the economic necessity loophole of section 1914?
4. If either of these options were to be implemented, and assuming that regionals would dispose of materials, there would be fewer archival copies of documents around. What if a disaster (flood, fire, earthquake...) were to occur? Alternative formats OK?
5. Some lending policies would have to be less restrictive.

The following were taken from Administrative Notes 14(13):45-46, 6/20/93 ...

1. Ability of the library to take on an added role.
 2. Willingness to accept the responsibilities for training, dissemination, archival functions and reference assistance within a subject field.
 3. Prospects for bringing more fugitive documents into the system since fewer copies might be needed for special subject collections (or increased communications with originating agency).
 4. Would current regionals or other large libraries be willing to take on the responsibility of serving a larger area?
 5. What are the incentives for becoming a Subject-based regional?
 6. How would the Subject-based Regional concept mesh with other components of the Depository program? Would the current regionals disappear? What geographic areas would Subject-based Regionals be expected to serve?
 7. How would this system compare in cost with the current system? At what level and by whom will costs be absorbed?
 8. Does it reach all user groups?
 9. Is access for the user quick enough to be useful and is access certain?
 10. Could a Subject-based Depository for Environmental Protection also be the Electronic Depository as well as serve as the National Collection for this topic?
 11. Could a Super-Regional serve as the National Collection for a particular topic based on geographical area?
 12. With new technologies providing instant access - would an exceptional National Collection library do away with the need for Super Regionals? Would it be a better use of resources to concentrate everything at that level except for selective depositories?
-

States With More Than One Regional Carol Gordon, Milwaukee Public Library

Since Maureen Harris of Clemson University will discuss "Libraries Sharing Regional Responsibilities within a State" which includes South Carolina and North Dakota, my report will concentrate on the remaining states with more than one regional. I contacted at least one regional from Alabama, Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas, and the conversations with those libraries netted a fairly uniform response.

In each case, the two regionals within the state have divided the state geographically--either by county, by Congressional District, by metropolitan/non-metro area, or by a designated state highway or other physical boundary--with each regional assuming responsibility for the selective depositories within its designated area. Those responsibilities include interlibrary loan/document delivery, technical assistance, reference assistance, collection development advice, on-site visits, approval of disposal lists, and information as required on the depository program. Aside from sharing duties related to their respective selectives, the institutions, for the most part, operate as independent entities.

With the exception of an occasional Shared Housing Agreement, the only formal collection or resource sharing agreement between regionals (which includes selectives as well) is in the state of Michigan. The Michigan Plan achieves the responsibility of regional libraries for retention of essentially all publications by "cooperative retention of older, lesser used materials at only one regional or designated library" and by allowing "selective depositories which have formal cooperative agreements specifying retention responsibilities (in the name of the regional depository)" to acquire and retain major sets of materials. The ultimate goal of this plan is "to ensure that there is a copy of every federal document of significant or enduring value somewhere in Michigan", and "to establish a system so each depository librarian may know the location of unique or strong collections in particular fields." ("Michigan Plan for the Federal Documents Depository Library System", 1993 Rev.) The extent to which resource sharing is being done in Michigan bears further investigation, but this, in essence, together with the development of appropriate locator systems, is one of the suggestions being explored for system wide regional cooperation.

Colorado has a unique cooperative agreement with respect to selective responsibilities. Although some duties are divided according to geographic designation, the University of Colorado at Boulder has agreed to handle all reference requests and all inquiries regarding the Depository Library Program from selectives throughout the state while Denver Public Library is responsible for all of the discard lists.

Although the two Wisconsin Regionals operate independently, the University of Wisconsin-Madison maintains a "shared regional" among the 18 or so libraries on the UW campus. While the regional headquarters and general collection is housed at the Wisconsin State Historical Society, the SuDocs arrangement is split among the Agricultural, Cartographic, Engineering, Law, and various other libraries with a locator file maintained to determine holdings at each site. As with some of the other states with two regionals, UW circulates its documents while Milwaukee Public Library handles documents as a reference collection providing short-term reference loans.

While intrastate "regional cooperation" varies a great deal, some of the plans and models could be examined more closely. Can some of these plans be adapted to multi-state or multi-region co-ops? What kinds of selective responsibilities can best be shared among regionals in a broader geographic context? Are some libraries positioning themselves to provide electronic data support to selectives in their states? If so, in what way? If "electronic centers" or IDEA (Information Depository for Electronic Access) libraries are developed, will state boundaries continue to be significant in the evolution of the Regional Library concept?

Libraries Sharing Regional Responsibilities Within a State **Maureen Harris, Clemson University**

For those states now having more than one Regional, this arrangement offers a "quick and dirty" means of alleviating at least some problems. Unlike other possible arrangements, the Shared Regional plan has already been approved by GPO, meets the requirements of Title 44 and has an operating history. It would take relatively little time for states (those having more than one Regional) to adapt the agreement used by South Carolina and North Dakota, get GPO approval and agree upon the division of responsibilities (the most likely scenario would be dividing up receipts and disposal responsibilities by agency and "oversight" by geography.) They could then start their own weeding projects, each one of the Shared Regional libraries weeding from those agencies for which it had relinquished responsibility and sending disposal lists to the other Shared Regional(s). The weeding would temporarily be an extra burden on the staff but could result in substantial gains in stack space. When disposals from Selectives resume (I would recommend temporarily suspending disposals from Selectives while the Shared Regionals disposed between/among themselves) each of the Shared Regionals would find their disposal lists greatly reduced with a resulting decrease in staff time devoted to the disposal process. And since each of the Shared Regionals would not have to take all publications from their "non-Regional" agencies, they could drop item numbers and save staff time with a reduction in receipts.

This "quick and dirty" solution to some of the problems of Regionals would not help the majority of Regionals unless they could enlist other large Selectives in their states to join them in a Shared Regional arrangement. (An alternative for some states would be to become a Shared Regional with a library in an adjoining state--but that is a topic for another paper.) However, it is worth pursuing for those Regionals with severe space problems which have at least one or two Selectives which could be persuaded to cooperate in such an arrangement. This is particularly true when the Selective(s) have collections and/or clientele that are complementary rather than overlapping with the original Regional.

I have stressed processing disposals, checking in new documents, and weeding (by former Regionals which become Shared Regionals) and the resulting freeing up of shelf space because those processes/problems are the ones that would be helped by having a Shared Regional within states. If shelf space and staff time for disposal processing and new documents check in are of vital importance, setting up a Shared Regional would help.

However, the Shared Regional plan does not really address some of the issues brought about by the addition to the depository program of electronic data in various formats. I think there are ways in which all Regionals can share the burdens and opportunities of digital data but I would consider confining the cooperation to libraries within state lines as artificial in the extreme.

This assertion brings me to one conclusion I have made in pondering the reorganizing of the Regional system. I think we need to consider separately the problems of large retrospective collections which are outgrowing the shelf space available to Regionals and the challenges of the new electronic era. Those libraries most able to take a lead in setting up the "virtual depository" of the future may not be the same as those having the hundreds of linear feet of irreplaceable documents. Certainly there will be some that would combine major retrospective holdings with extensive technical expertise and equipment but I question whether the numbers of depositories that could be so described is sufficient to "carry the load" as permanent repositories for everything AND "electronic centers" for digital data for all depositories. I see the "Shared Regional within a state" idea as a workable plan for alleviating the burden of disposal lists and checking in new shipments. As such, the Shared Regional idea is well worth implementing in those states with more than one Regional and worth exploring for those states with one Regional but with other large Selectives.

Questions:

1. Can "sharing regional responsibilities within a state" offer a solution for problems being experienced by some or all Regionals? (my answer: yes, especially for creating stack space by mutual disposals between/among Shared Regionals.)
 2. Can the effort of creating "shared regional responsibilities with a state" be justified by the potential benefits? (my answer: yes for at least some Regionals; the paperwork for following the SC and ND scenario would be minimal and GPO would surely be willing to speed up approval; the remaining effort involved finding Selectives willing to become Shared Regionals (for those states with only one Regional) and weeding which would have to be done under any plan for those Regionals which have space problems (assuming the new Regional plan addresses space problems.))
 3. What problems can "sharing regional responsibilities within a state" alleviate? (my answer: space problems (weeding would free up stack space), and staffing problems (less staff time would be devoted to processing disposals and checking in new receipts); other time savings are possible but would vary among libraries concerned (i.e. sharing electronic expertise, etc.))
 4. What problems would NOT be solved by "sharing regional responsibilities within a state"? (my answer: most of all of the problems related to government data in electronic formats--but maybe that's because I lack the imagination to see how.)
-

**USDA/Cornell Cooperative Project:
Implications for an "Electronic Depository"
Greg Lawrence, Cornell University**

The concept of an "electronic depository library" is difficult to discuss. Just as there are widely different depositories for print materials, we can probably expect there to be similar variations for electronic collections. Unfortunately, there are few collections of electronic government resources available for inspection, and we are left to speculate on what a electronic depository should be.

I believe we shouldn't create libraries which are primarily Internet access pointers (such as FEDWORLD and many federal agency gophers), and don't themselves serve up a substantial collection of electronic monographs, serials, and databases. Depository libraries need to create unique collections of information which are broad, deep and lasting. Also, an electronic library shouldn't be a collection of workstations within a reference area which are inaccessible from a distance (i.e. across a state or region). An electronic library eventually will have to evolve to the point where access to electronic documents expands beyond the four walls of the institution. A basic benchmark of performance for any electronic depository library collection will have to include some method of offsite telephone or network access to the government information it acquires. And I believe an electronic library shouldn't be expected to be everything to everyone. It's not practical, and I suspect it just can't be done (or at least not done well). Judicious selection of materials will probably be more important for the evolving electronic library than pure technical know-how.

I work at Albert R. Mann Library, at Cornell University, which is very interested in the theme of the electronic library. How my library works out its approach to the electronic future may not coincide with your vision, but I offer it up as a focus to some of the questions about an electronic depository library.

Mann Library has over 600 electronic titles, the majority of which are bibliographic databases and statistical datasets. Quite a few of these titles are government produced, and are in high demand with our primary clients, the Colleges of Agriculture and Life Sciences and Human Ecology. All government information, including electronic information, is "mainstreamed" into the various generic activities of the Library: selection, acquisitions, cataloging and reference. We take extra effort not to make a project out of electronic information.

The Library provides access to this body of electronic government information in a variety of ways: Internet access to agricultural economic data sets from USDA, on-site LAN access to Census Bureau CD-ROM titles, and dedicated workstations for numerous government titles published on either diskette or CD-ROM. Our long range plans include making more resources Internet accessible, as well as enhancing workstations to address hardware needs certain titles demand, such as the Digital Orthophotoquads. We provide users with access to government produced data management software such as EXTRACT, as well as ArcInfo, dBASE, Lotus 1-2-3 or Quattro Pro, and numerous other commercial software tools. Our reference staff can supply users with ready reference support, formal class instruction, or personal assistance in data extraction by appointment.

Mann Library is different than most depository libraries by the fact that we contract directly with an agency, the USDA Economic Research Service (ERS), to provide internet access for their statistical data sets. GPO is not a partner in this arrangement. The Library's association with ERS provides us with support not found with depository materials: direct access to agency personnel, product support, timely data acquisition, patron referral, and notification of publishing trends. ERS gets the assistance of information professionals and another channel of information distribution.

I've taken some questions we had to examine and tried to pose them as questions Regional libraries may have to address:

1. What level of electronic access does a Regional want to develop?
 2. Do you expect to develop access services in-house, as a member of a cooperative project, or will you purchase commercial services?
 3. Government information spans many disciplines. Is there a core of government information that must be made available electronically? Who decides the content of that core?
 4. Is disseminating these core titles the responsibility of the regional, the selective, or both?
 5. Should a Regional seek the role of coordinator of information services within its territory? Do you think the Regional needs to be technically competent to assert this role, or do you think it is more a need for skilled administration?
 6. Which information should be made accessible at a specific level of access? Should this information duplicate information held in a depository library elsewhere?
 7. Can we possibly establish a uniform base level of service we will apply to all depository libraries? Can depository libraries afford to meet those standards? Can depository libraries afford not to?
 8. Do you think GPO should be the primary broker for all your information needs, or should there be a variety of information channels. (Put another way, which is a greater evil, less information or more chaos?).
 9. Do you think electronic information dissemination standards for the DLP should originate with depository libraries? Should they be imposed by GPO? By some other federal authority?
-

Regional Libraries Covering More Than One State

Daniel O'Mahony, Brown University

Six Regional depository libraries currently service states beyond their own home state borders. (See chart below.) While all of these regionals share common responsibilities and activities in providing regional services to selectives in other states, each situation has grown out of and adapted to local needs and developments.

Where the multi-state concept has been most successful, there has been strong support at the regional institution by the library's administration. Many regional libraries choose to have a comprehensive collection on site in order to meet the needs of their primary constituencies, and extend regional services to neighboring states as part of their service function. For a cross-state arrangement to work smoothly over time, it is essential to get the long-term commitment of the participating institutions. For some states, the cross-state regional services were part of their state plans. At least one regional library receives some financial compensation from the outside state to help defray the costs of regional services. Most regional librarians try to attend the major library conferences of the other state(s), some have made site inspection visits to out-of- state libraries, and all are available for consultation and advice via phone, e-mail, etc.

The states without regionals tend to have well-developed formal and informal networks of cooperation and communication. Active and efficient interlibrary loan systems, shared online catalogs, and cooperative union lists in these states help ease the burden on the out-of-state regional. Many states collectively select 85-95 percent of the depository items, and in most cases there exists at least one large selective (75+ percent) within the state. The selectives also tend to take on some of the leadership/educational/consultative roles themselves in lieu of an in-state regional library, trying to be as self-sufficient as possible. Most of the libraries in these states were connected to electronic networks or had Internet access.

Some common advantages to having or administering a multi-state region were identified. For the regional library, the ability to draw from a larger pool of selectives helped when filling gaps in the regional's comprehensive collection. Similarly, having a larger region widened the scope of librarians and expert staff available for regular referral, assistance, and professional collaboration. This can be especially important in sharing expertise about new technologies, etc. (where the regional might not necessarily be the "lead" library). The overall cost savings to the program by having fewer comprehensive collections was mentioned, especially in areas where the population was relatively small. For the selectives in states without regionals, the most obvious advantage was reaping the benefits of being serviced by a regional library, most notably, permitting them to discard materials and having a familiar contact for program advice, interpretation, and consultation.

Servicing depositories outside a library's home state, however, does place additional burdens on the regional library. Areas and operations that are already problematic (e.g., discard lists) can be exacerbated by out-of-state demands. Without formal compensation, services to out-of-state libraries may be seen in competition with services to in-state depositories, especially in times of limited/declining budgets. Also, as the geographic service

area of a regional library widens, it becomes more difficult to visit the selective depositories, and more difficult for staff in remote libraries to participate in regional activities. Electronic mail, teleconferencing, and videoconferencing are examples of some of the ways regionals are trying to overcome the distance problems.

A variety of other suggestions were offered which apply to the operation and administration of the program as a whole, not just the multi-state regional concept. Some librarians called into question the need for a "comprehensive" collection in each state, suggesting that we rethink which items need to reside in every state versus simply be available somewhere from just a few locations. The notion of a "national depository library" was also suggested, as was the idea of dividing up some materials based on subject strength. Most librarians agreed that the system should accommodate some type of cooperative collection plan (e.g., USGS DOQs, DOE fiche). Others, however, pointed out the advantages to having deliberately redundant or overlapping collections in one state or region. Many librarians called for more flexibility and creativity in treating discards.

Questions/issues for consideration:

- a. In a multi-state system or a system that is not strictly bound by state borders, how should "regions" be determined? What is a reasonable definition of a "region" (number of libraries, geographic area, other)?
- b. Is it necessary to have comprehensive collections in each state?
- c. How might the discard/retention requirements be revised to make the system more responsive to library needs while still meeting the program obligation for accountability and collection coverage.
- d. When is cooperative collection development most useful, and how might cooperative collection management policies and agreements be developed/administered/supported/enforced?
- e. How might specific services (educational, consultative) performed by regionals be shared among libraries in the region (or nationally)?
- f. What level and kinds of compensation/support should be required as part of carrying out regional responsibilities (staffing, hardware, etc.)? How can/should such compensation/support be funded (federally, libraries in region, etc.)?

STATES SHARING REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES WITH OTHER STATES

STATES Reg. Non-Reg.	#Select.	#Cong. Dists.	Population	Area (1000 sq.mi.)
CT	21	6	3,287,116	4.8
RI	12	2	1,003,464	1.0
Total	33	8	4,290,580	5.8
ME	11	2	1,227,928	30.9
NH	9	2	1,109,252	9.0
VT	8	1	562,758	9.2
Total	28	5	2,899,938	49.1
MD	20 (23)*	8	4,781,468	9.7
DE	5	1	666,168	1.9
DC	16 (49)*	1	606,900	.061
Total	41 (77)*	10	6,054,536	11.7
MN	25	8	4,375,099	79.6
SD	10	1	696,004	75.9
Total	35	9	5,071,103	155.5
UT	10	3	1,722,850	82.2
WY	10	1	453,588	97.1
Total	20	4	2,176,438	179.3
WA	21	9	4,866,692	66.6
AK	9	1	550,043	570.4
Total	30	10	5,416,735	637.0

* Numbers in parentheses include Federal agency depository libraries.

Note: The following regionals were not included in this study: FL (serves Panama, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands) and HI (serves American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands).

Operational Issues

Paul Pattwell, Newark Public Library

Collection Development:

Except for the recent USGS orthoquad compact discs, Regionals have always been required to receive and permanently retain all items offered through the Federal Depository Library Program. The only items allowed to be discarded are superseded items and one format of an item if the same item is received in more than one format.

As a result, Regionals have to cope with finding sufficient housing (shelving, fiche cabinets, map cabinets, CD cabinets, etc.) to store an always expanding 100% depository collection. Regionals cannot always predict how much expansion space will be needed on a short-term or long-term basis, since the volume of material received is directly related to the ebb and flow of government information (e.g. the huge surge of DOE fiche in the mid-80s). Some Regionals are able to relieve the pressure for space by farming out portions of the depository collection to other libraries via selective housing agreements.

Regionals also need sufficient staff to adequately accession, process, and catalog their complete depository collections. The materials must be retrievable, because Regional collections are expected to be the collection of last resort for their area; likewise, Regionals are expected to keep their depository collections as intact as possible in order to service selective depositories. Regionals are expected to aggressively provide for the binding of appropriate depository materials.

If Regionals continue to receive all items distributed in electronic formats, it will be very difficult for most of them to mount, display, and interpret every item in order to provide public access. It is extremely unlikely that many Regionals will be able to provide complete public access to all the government databases being proposed as depository items, at least for the short term.

Disposition of Government Publications:

A selective depository cannot dispose of any depository publication (except one that has been superseded) without the approval of its Regional. This can be a tremendous burden for many Regionals, especially those with many selectives in their area. Although the idea behind the procedure is to assure that the Regional can fill in any gaps in its collection and then make discarded publications available to other libraries, it can become a major administrative component in a Regional's workflow and demand a substantial amount of professional and clerical staff time.

Depository Inspections:

Regionals are expected to accompany GPO Inspectors on their inspections of selective depositories in their areas. There are obvious benefits -- a greater understanding of specific selective depositories' needs, problems, and accomplishments; the ability to act as an

interface between the Inspector and the selective; etc. However, since GPO provides no financial assistance to Regionals to perform this function, it can be very difficult for a Regional to obtain the funding to cover incurred expenses. As with depository disposition problems, the disparity between Regionals -- specifically the size of the Regional area and the number of selectives within the area -- makes for an extremely uneven balance of administrative responsibilities from one Regional to the next. What is an acceptable workload for one Regional can be impossible for another. The result is that selective depositories across the nation receive a wide variety of assistance from their Regionals; likewise, Regionals are not consistent in performing their administrative obligations.

Other Issues:

Will all of the above responsibilities to contend with, it is difficult for many Regionals to adequately deal with the other obligations that are part of Regional designation. Although many do their best to consult with their selectives on a one-to-one basis as needed, there are not always the resources available to construct more formal outreach programs, cooperative plans, etc.

In General:

Regionals are required to do everything selectives do, but on a larger scale, as well as be responsible for obligations required only of Regionals. This is occurring during an extended period of reduced library funding, less staffing, and an overall decline in available resources.

Although Regionals genuinely want to do everything, there is just too much to be done. As the depository system, especially the distribution of government information, has expanded and grown, GPO does not appear to have attempted to reduce Regional responsibilities at all. The latest rounds of inspections indicate that GPO unrealistically expects Regionals to continue doing just as much and in some cases (requiring Regionals to respond to surveys) even more.

Possible Title 44 Revision GPO Staff

Following are some of our general thoughts regarding the question of what can be done under existing law. Under the Printing Act of 1962, provisions for regional depository libraries were added under 44 U.S.C. section 1912. Since that time precedents for several models have been put in place.

1. Two regionals per state, e.g., Michigan, Alabama, Oklahoma, etc.
2. One regional in a state, e.g., California, North Carolina, Ohio, etc.
3. One regional serving several states or U.S. territories, e.g., Maine, Minnesota, Florida, etc.
4. Shared regionals, i.e. two libraries in one state which together select 100%, e.g., North Dakota and South Carolina.
5. One full regional in a state and one shared regional, e.g., Wisconsin.

Under the existing precedents and approval process under section 1912, there is no reason why some states with a large number of depositories to serve, e.g., California, New York, Illinois, etc., could not adopt option #1, 4, or 5. Several libraries in these states select between 80-95% of the available items numbers right now.

Due to financial, space, equipment, and staffing exigencies in many states, one library, in a state with two regionals and serving a proportionately smaller number of selective depositories and population, could voluntarily relinquish regional depository status but retain a high selection rate.

Selective housing for large documents series, e.g., maps and DOE microfiche to name two, have been in place in New Jersey, Michigan, Connecticut, etc., for some time. Their partners then retain and service the "regional" collection. This scenario has been expanded to include electronic deliverables such as TIGER/Line files and DOQs.

Some states with relatively new regionals, e.g., Tennessee, Arkansas, etc., have negotiated agreements for cooperative archival collections as part of their State Plans. Selective libraries in their states retain the major retrospective series and act as the "regional" to service the materials. Using this scenario, key libraries within a state, by negotiated agreement, could serve as the regional for future electronic deliverables.

Under existing law, there is the potential for "super regionals" in sections of the country but not in the way the Ad hoc Committee envisions. Expanding option 3 in New England, two of the three regionals serving the six states could give up regional status but still select a high percentage of item numbers to fulfill the "just in time" rather than "just in case" philosophy.

With electronic dissemination, whether on-line or off-line products, the potential government locators, storage facilities, on-demand publishing, etc., it certainly appears that there will be justification to use Title 44, U.S.C., section 1914, which states "The Public Printer, with the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing, ... may use any measures he considers necessary for the economical and practical implementation of this chapter."

We have discussed these matters with the GPO Office of General Counsel. They will work with us to provide guidance on what may be permissible under Title 44 but would like specific proposals from the Ad hoc Committee on which to respond.

DLC Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure

Members

Tom Andersen
California State Library
tanderse@library.ca.gov
Phone: 916-653-0085
Fax: 916-654-0241

Greg Lawrence
Cornell University
GWL1@cornell.edu
Phone: 607-255-3242
Fax: 607-255-0318

Gary Cornwell, Chair
University of Florida
garcorn@nervm.nerdc.ufl.edu
Phone: 904-392-0366
Fax: 904-392-7251

Daniel O'Mahony
Brown University
ap201159@brownvm.brown.edu
Phone: 401-863-2522
Fax: 401-863-1272

Cynthia Etkin
Western Kentucky University
etkin@wkyuvm.wku.edu
Phone: 502-745-6175
Fax: 502-745-5943

Paul Pattwell
Newark Public Library
pattwell@pilot.njin.net
Phone: 201-733-7812
Fax: 201-733-5648

Maureen Harris
Clemson University
maureen@clemson.edu
Phone: 803-656-5174
Fax: 803-656-3025

Jay Young/Sheila McGarr
Government Printing Office
inspect@access.digex.net
Phone: 202-512-1119
Fax: 202-512-1432



Table of Contents

Make Your Reservations for the Spring 1995 Depository	
Library Council Meeting	1
Depository Library Council Meeting Agenda, Spring 1995	2
Depository Library Council Members, Revised February 22, 1995	5
DLC Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure	
Depository Library Council Meeting	7
Vision Statement for Regional Depositories	9
Operational Issues / Tom Andersen	12
Subject-Based Collections: Issues for Regional/National	
Coverage / Cindy Etkin	14
States With More Than One Regional / Carol Gordon	16
Libraries Sharing Regional Responsibilities Within a State /	
Maureen Harris	17
USDA/Cornell Cooperative Project: Implications for an "Electronic	
Depository" / Greg Lawrence	19
Regional Libraries Covering More Than One State / Daniel O'Mahony	21
Operational Issues / Paul Pattwell	24
Possible Title 44 Revision / GPO Staff	26
DLC Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure: Members	27

Administrative Notes is published in Washington, DC by the Superintendent of Documents, Library Programs Service, Government Printing Office, for the staffs of U.S. Federal Depository Libraries. It is published on the 15th day of each month; some months have additional issues. Postmaster send address changes to:

The Editor, *Administrative Notes*
U.S. Government Printing Office
Library Programs Service, SLL
Washington, D.C. 20401

Editor: Marian W. MacGilvray

(202) 512-1130